



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,741	07/03/2003	John C. S. Koo	31045-101	5633
24318	7590	01/24/2006	EXAMINER	
Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp, LLP 11377 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064			STASHICK, ANTHONY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

E

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/613,741	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOO, JOHN C. S.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anthony Stashick	<b>Art Unit</b> 3728	

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –  
Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2005.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11152005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 15, 2005 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant states that support for the added claim language can be found on page 12, line 24 through page 13 line 2 of the specification. However, nowhere in this section of the specification does it discuss that a plurality of indentations is predominantly uncoated while a plurality of lower-extending portions are coated. Furthermore, this section fails to teach "a plurality of small particles bonded differentially to different areas of the bottom surface, with each of a plurality of the lower extending portions being coated more than each of the plurality of indentations." This area of the specification is silent as to the comparison between the coating of the indentations to the coating of the protrusions.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 11-12, 19-20 and 24-29-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kester et al. 4,356,643 in view of Shin 4,658,514. Kester '643 discloses substantially all the limitations of the claims including the following: a shoe (see Figure 2) comprising a bottom surface (bottom of 11) that is adjacent to the ground in normal use and that has a plurality of indentations (that located between projections 14), with lower extending portions 14 between the indentations (see Figure 2); a sole 11 that forms at least a portion of the bottom surface; an upper portion 13 extending above the sole; a plurality of small particles 18 bonded (see col. 2, lines 16-19) to at least some of the lower extending portions (see Figure 2); at least 1,000 small particles are bonded to the at least some lower extending portions (see Figure 3); the small particles are bonded to the at least some of the lower extending portions using adhesive material (see col. 2, lines 16-19); the small particles comprises a fabric material (18 is made of nylon material, a fabric material); the small particles have been bonded directly onto the at least some of the lower extending portions (see Figures 2 and 3); the sole is sufficiently durable for commercially acceptable outdoor use (see col. 2, lines 20-31); the sole includes an outsole that is comprised of at least one of leather, natural rubber and synthetic rubber (see col. 1, lines 43-49); the small particles cover at least 50% of the portion of the bottom surface that normally comes into contact with the ground (see Figures 1-3); the sole is sufficiently strong for commercially acceptable outdoor use (see col. 1, lines 4-47); the bottom surface has at least five indentations (see Figure 2); at least some of the indentations are very narrow (see potion at front edge of heel); at least one of the indentations is approximately 1-2 millimeters in width (see indentations in forefoot area); at least some of the

Art Unit: 3728

indentations are closely spaced (see First two indentations at front edge of heel in Figure 2); at least two of the indentations are separated from each other by no more than approximately 2 millimeters (see first two indentations at front edge of heel; a plurality of small particles bonded differentially to different areas of the bottom surface (see Figures 1 and 5, bonded in different directions); the indentations ordinarily do not contact the ground (see Figure 2). Kester et al. '643 does not disclose each of the plurality of projections is predominantly uncoated with the small particles or the lower extending portions being coated more than each of the plurality of indentations. Shin '514 teaches that the sole of a shoe can have protrusions 76 and indentations (slots 50, see col. 3, lines 10-23) with the protrusions having ridges 78 applied thereto to aid in affording traction to the user. Shin '514 further teaches that the indentations (slots 50) are provided to act as hinges and allow bending of the sole. Shin '514 shows these indentations without any traction elements because this section does not touch the ground and the traction elements would prevent complete bending of the sole in these areas. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to remove the traction elements 16, 17, 18 from the sole of Kester et al. '643, or not place these traction elements, in the area of the indentations to allow the sol to completely flex without removing the traction gained by adding these elements to the protrusions. Furthermore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to not place these traction elements in the indentations of Kester et al. '643, since it has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions as before involves only routine skill in the art, *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied above in view of Knoche et al. 6,782,642. The references as applied above disclose all the limitations of the claim except for the small particles being bonded to at least some of the lower extending portions by embedding the small particles directly into the bottom surface using at least one of heat and pressure.

Knoche et al. '643 teaches that particles attached to the bottom of a sole can be placed in a molded and pressed or embedded into the sole to help hold the particles on the sole to gain traction. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to embed the particles of the references as applied above into the sole surface to aid in holding the particles to the surface to aid in gaining traction.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 5 above in view of Giese, Jr. 2,663,097. The references as applied to claim 5 disclose all the limitations of the claim except for the fabric particles being applied by a flocking technique. Giese, Jr. '0097 teaches that particles can be attached to the sole of a shoe by flocking to help gain traction on slippery surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to flock the particles onto the bottom sole of the shoe to help hold the particles onto the bottom of the shoe to gain traction, as taught by Giese, Jr.

9. Claims 7-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above in view of Official Notice. The references as applied to claim 1 above disclose all the limitations of the claims except for the for the particle material being made of natural or synthetic leather, natural or synthetic rubber, plastic, Official Notice is taken that it is well known within the art of anti-slip material to use natural or synthetic leather, natural or synthetic rubber or plastic particles to prevent slipping of one surface on another. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the particles of the references as

Art Unit: 3728

applied to claim 1 out of natural or synthetic leather, natural or synthetic rubber, or plastic as these materials are well known and used in the art for aiding in slip prevention.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above in view of Bible 4,779,360. The references as applied to claim 1 above discloses all the limitations of the claim except for the particles comprising metal. Bible '360 teaches that grit material used to gain grip on slippery surfaces can be made of aluminum oxide, silicon carbide or tungsten carbide (i.e. metals) for their durability, less tendency to crumble and their hardness to scratch or furrow up metallic slippery surfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the grit particles of the references as applied to claim 1 above out of metal, as taught by Bible '360, to aid in gaining grip on metallic or rough surfaces.

11. Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the references as applied to claim 1 above. The references as applied to claim 1 above disclose all the limitations of the claims except for the ASTM tear resistance and abrasion resistance requirements. It appears that since these requirements are standards, it would be well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to make a sole to meet these requirements. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the sole of the references as applied to claim 1 above meet the tear and abrasion resistance standards.

12. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 in view of Schaffer et al. 5,276,981. The references as applied to claim 1 above disclose all the limitations of the claims except for the particle wearing off over certain time frames. Schaffer et al. '981 teaches that the material for particles attached to the bottom of shoe soles to aid in gaining traction can be modified to wear over given time frames, including weeks (see col. 2, lines 3-21). Therefore, it would have been well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the

Art Unit: 3728

material of the particles attached to the sole of the references as applied to claim 1 above to last over any time period desired, as taught by Schaffer et al. '981, to determine the wear life of the sole of the shoe.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, applicant's arguments about where there is support for the feature and argued under Remarks, paragraphs 3 and 4 should be addressed here. Applicant states that support for the added claim language can be found on page 12, line 24 through page 13 line 2 of the specification. This section of the specification is printed here for ease of referral. "An advantage of this latter technique is illustrated in Figure 4, which shows a portion of a cross-section of a shoe sole 40 that includes an insole 42 and an outsole 44. As shown in Figure 4, the bottom portion of outsole 44 includes multiple indentations (or indented surface area) 52. Typically, such indentations 52 will be closely spaced and/or a very narrow, with multiple (e.g., 2, 5, 10 or more) such indentations 52 occurring when traversing the bottom of the shoe sole 40 from side to side and/or from front to back. Often, the indentations 52 will be approximately 1-2 millimeters (mm) in width and/or separated from each other by no more than approximately 1-2 mm of lower extending portions 54. However, any desired widths and/or spacings may be used." Nowhere in this section of the specification does it discuss that a plurality of indentations is predominantly uncoated while a plurality of lower-extending portions are coated. Furthermore, this section fails to teach "a plurality of small particles bonded differentially to different areas of the bottom surface, with each of a plurality of the lower extending portions being coated more than each of the plurality of indentations." This area of the specification is silent as to the comparison between the coating of the indentations to the coating of the protrusions.



Art Unit: 3728

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Stashick whose telephone number is 571-272-4561. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 am until 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Anthony Stashick  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3728

ADS